REMARKS

Currently claims 6-8, 10-14, 25-45 are pending in the above-identified application. By this Reply, Applicants file a Request for Continued Examination (RCE), and an accompanying Amendment for claims 6, 25, 30, 34 and 35. The Examiner is respectfully requested to enter the Amendment subsequent to conducting the continued examination of the claimed invention.

I. Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner has rejected claims 6-8, 10-14, 25-29 and 34-44 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,029,141 to Bezos et al. (hereinafter "Bezos") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,324,552 to Chang et al. (hereinafter "Chang"), and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,761,071 to Bernstein et al. (hereinafter "Bernstein"); and rejects claims 14 and 45 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bezos in view of Chang and further in view of Shafer et al. (hereinafter "Shafer"); and rejects claims 30-33 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by, or in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Chang. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

With respect to the primary combination of Bezos, Chang and Bernstein under § 103, and as applied to independent claim 6, for example, Applicants respectfully assert that the combination fails to at least disclose the claimed invention.

That is to say that none of the references, as asserted above, either alone or in combination, disclose as recited in independent claim 6,

> "A client portal for facilitating the purchase of a particular product supported by a computing device, comprising: *inter alia*
>
> a rendering portion supported by the association of the preselected sites delivers seamlessly integrated content for a product directory listing relating to the particular product for display to an authorized user,
>
> wherein at least one of the preselected sites lists sites that are available for preselection and based upon the user-selection of the preselected sites stored on a computer-readable memory, the client portal will access related content and dynamically associate the related content to an application interface."

Instead, Bezos discusses a standard web-browser 112 and not one particularly directed to the retrieval and access protocols indicative of a portal. See, for example, Bezos, column 6, lines 59-63. Accordingly, Bezos does not disclose Applicants claimed invention of a client portal.

With regards to Chang, Applicants respectfully assert that Chang may assist certain browsers with regards to data access. However, Chang is not a portal and expressly discusses connecting through to pages which may be at a maximum allowable query depth (within a preselected search range). Chang may further interpret the pages for undesirable content such as, for example, "hot links" which would direct the user to additional information or content not contained within the predetermined search range. Although when Chang determines that undesirable content does exist, Chang filters or otherwise removes the undesirable content from the location or page. See, for example, column 2, lines 2-6.

Clearly, the additional removal or filtering of content found within a particular page or location speaks to an operation that is strongly contrary to a "seamlessly integrated" operation of a portal where content is presented when the portal is active. With the inventive portal, and as recited in claim 6, the source of the content has been predetermined, and content from the predetermined source is seamlessly integrated (presented for display to an authorized user) when transferred to the portal as the portal is activated by a browser capable of retrieving content only through preselected sites that are related to providing the particular content. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that Chang does not disclose Applicants' claimed invention for at least this basis.

With regards to Bernstein, and even assuming *in arguendo* that Bernstein may discuss masking user access to, and display of an address line for entry and display of a URL, which Applicants do not concede, Applicants maintain the assertion that any alleged disclosure of a particular masking or method to obscure the address line from view, does not disclose Applicants invention. In fact, Bernstein when allegedly applied in combination with Chang, would operate to defeat the particular benefit of the alleged combination. That is to say that a masking or obscuring from view of the address line would clearly contradict any ability for a user to manipulate their particular web surfing experience by acting within the preset depth parameter, as asserted by the Examiner.

Therefore, Applicants are of the opinion that the combination of at least Chang and Bernstein, operate at cross purposes, and cannot be reasonably combined with Bezos, to render the instant claimed invention obvious.

For at least the basis asserted above, Applicants respectfully request that the asserted combination of Bezos in view of Chang, and further in view of Bernstein, fails to meet the burden of a *prima facie* case of rejection under § 103, and must be withdrawn.

Applicants respectfully assert that for at least the reasons asserted above, the rejection of independent claim 6 and similarly independent claim 25, and independent claims 34 and 35, are similarly patentably distinct over the asserted combination. Furthermore, for at least the basis by which they depend from the recited patentably distinct independent claims, claims 7-8, 10-14, 26-29 and 36-44 are similarly patentably distinct, for at least the basis that they directly or indirectly depend from a patentably distinct independent claim as well as the additional features that they recite therein.

With regards to claims 14 and 45, which are rejected under § 103 as being unpatentable over Bezos in view of Chang and further in view of Shafer, Applicants respectfully assert that for at least the same basis asserted above, claims 14 and 45 which depend directly or indirectly from a patentably distinct independent base claim, Applicants assert that claims 14 and 45 are similarly patentably distinct for at least the basis asserted above.

Accordingly, the rejection of claims 14 and 45 under § 103 over Bezos in view of Chang and Shafer, is respectfully improper and accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraw it.

Finally, with regards to claims 30-33, which are rejected under § 102(e), or in the alternative under § 103(a) over Chang, Applicants further assert that for at least the same basis as asserted above with independent claim 6, claims 30-33, which depend directly or indirectly from a patentably distinct independent base claim, are also themselves patentably distinct for at least that basis, as well as the additional features contained therein.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the asserted rejection of claims 30-33 over Chang under § 102 or § 103 is similarly improper and must be withdrawn.

VI. Conclusion

In view of the above amendment, Applicants believe the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact William D. Titcomb Reg. No. 46,463 at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37.C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: July 10, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

By _____
Michael K. Mutter
Registration No.: 29,680
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
8110 Gatehouse Road
Suite 100 East
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000
Attorney for Applicants